

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

105th Congress
2nd Session

Vote No. 41

March 25, 1998, 1:55 pm
Page S-2531 Temp. Record

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL/Non-Emergency Funding for Bosnia

SUBJECT: Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1998 . . . S. 1768. Stevens motion to table the Feingold amendment No. 2121.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 92-8

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1768, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1998, will provide \$3.109 billion in mandatory and discretionary budget authority, including \$1.992 billion in emergency funding for the Department of Defense, \$561.9 million to respond to natural disasters and other emergencies, and \$278.0 million in other discretionary supplemental appropriations. A total of \$273.9 million in rescissions and other offsets will also be enacted.

The Feingold amendment would remove the emergency designation for the funding for the military operations in Bosnia. The emergency designations for the funding for the military operations in Southwest Asia (Iraq) and for the funding to respond to natural disasters would be retained.

During debate, Senator Stevens moved to table the Feingold amendment. A motion to table is not debatable; however, some debate preceded the making of the motion. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

When we passed the Defense Appropriations Bill last year it was with the understanding that United States forces would be out of Bosnia by June 30, 1998. Therefore, we only provided enough funding for that deployment until that date. President Clinton was given the option of extending the deployment if he found it necessary, but the expectation at the time was that he would not. That expectation was not correct, so we now have the unexpected need to pay for continuing the deployment for the rest of the fiscal year. The President has authority to reprogram funds from the rest of the Department of Defense to pay those unexpected costs, but if

(See other side)

YEAS (92)				NAYS (8)		NOT VOTING (0)	
Republican (50 or 91%)		Democrats (42 or 93%)		Republicans (5 or 9%)	Democrats (3 or 7%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka	Inouye	Ashcroft	Feingold		
Allard	Inhofe	Baucus	Kennedy	Brownback	Johnson		
Bennett	Jeffords	Biden	Kerrey	Gramm	Kohl		
Bond	Kempthorne	Bingaman	Kerry	Grassley			
Burns	Kyl	Boxer	Landrieu	Nickles			
Campbell	Lott	Breaux	Lautenberg				
Chafee	Lugar	Bryan	Leahy				
Coats	Mack	Bumpers	Levin				
Cochran	McCain	Byrd	Lieberman				
Collins	McConnell	Cleland	Mikulski				
Coverdell	Murkowski	Conrad	Moseley-Braun				
Craig	Roberts	Daschle	Moynihan				
D'Amato	Roth	Dodd	Murray				
DeWine	Santorum	Dorgan	Reed				
Domenici	Sessions	Durbin	Reid				
Enzi	Shelby	Feinstein	Robb				
Faircloth	Smith, Bob	Ford	Rockefeller				
Frist	Smith, Gordon	Glenn	Sarbanes				
Gorton	Snowe	Graham	Torricelli				
Grams	Specter	Harkin	Wellstone				
Gregg	Stevens	Hollings	Wyden				
Hagel	Thomas						
Hatch	Thompson						
Helms	Thurmond						
Hutchinson	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

he used that authority it would seriously disrupt defense operations. Those funds would have to be taken out of readiness and quality of life funds that remain to be spent this year for those forces that are not currently deployed. Most of those funds have already been spent, plus we believe that the amount provided for them already was inadequate. Forcing defense cuts in order to pay for the unexpected costs in Bosnia would be harmful to national security and would be unfair to the men and women of the Armed Forces who would be affected. We are ready and willing to address in the up-coming authorization and appropriations process whether the President was right to declare that the United States' commitment in Bosnia is now open-ended. Many of us have opposed having our forces in that country from the outset, and will do everything we can to end the deployment. However, that fight is for the future. Our responsibility at this point is to make sure that our forces in Bosnia have the support they need, and that giving that support will not come at the expense of our national security or the quality of life of our troops. Therefore, we urge our colleagues to table the Feingold amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

When military forces were first sent to Bosnia (in 1995) it was without congressional approval. After the fact, the Senate barely, and with great reluctance, agreed to a temporary, 1-year commitment. The cost of making that commitment, Members were assured, would not exceed \$2 billion. Many of us were very skeptical at that time that there would be any possible way (or inclination on the part of the Clinton Administration) to extricate United States forces within 1 year of their being committed, and we were equally disinclined to believe the \$2 billion price tag. We were right. Military forces are still in Bosnia, President Clinton has said that the operation will continue indefinitely, and the price tag to date is a huge \$8 billion. Over the years, this deployment has remained controversial, and we have tried to bring it to a close. However, Senators who want to support the President, Senators who are fearful of having a divided policy that could put our deployed troops at risk, and even a few Senators who think it is a good idea to have troops in Bosnia indefinitely have been able to block our efforts.

When the Senate passed the defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998, it only included funds for Bosnia through June 30, as our colleagues have pointed out. That fact does not mean, though, that Senators expected our troops to be out by that date. Congress gave the President the option of extending the deployment, and we believe that most Members expected him to exercise that option. Congress and the President basically struck a deal on Bosnia. The President could continue the deployment at the end of the year, but to avoid seriously disrupting military operations he would have to ask for emergency funding, which would be in addition to other defense spending. In other words, Congress and the President had a tacit understanding that the price of the President continuing the deployment would be that only part of the costs could come out of the defense budget, and the rest would have to come from an overall increase in defense spending. In other words, the emergency funding for the continuing costs in Bosnia cannot truly be called emergency funding. It is just the conclusion of a tacit agreement to get around the defense spending limits. We should not support this ruse. We therefore urge our colleagues to support the Feingold amendment, which would strike the emergency designation for the Bosnia funds.